



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,247	10/27/2003	Wayne Dawson	F-8015	5890
28107 7590 06/27/2008 JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP 122 EAST 42ND STREET SUITE 4000 NEW YORK, NY 10168				
EXAMINER				
SKOWRONEK, KARL HEINZ R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1631				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/27/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/695,247

Applicant(s)

DAWSON ET AL

Examiner

KARLHEINZ R. SKOWRONEK

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE-US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status

Claims 2-11 are pending.

Claims 1 and 12-13 are cancelled.

Claims 2-11 are being examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks p. 13, filed 15 February 2008, with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 3-7 as non-statutory under 35 USC 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1 and 3-7 has been withdrawn in view of the amendments made to the claims.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 2-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 2-11 are drawn to a process. A statutory process must include a step of a physical transformation, or produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result (State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc. CAFC 47 USPQ2d 1596 (1998), AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications Inc. (CAFC 50 USPQ2d 1447 (1999)). The instant claims do not result in a physical

transformation, thus the Examiner must determine if the instant claims include a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

As noted in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.* CAFC 47 USPQ2d 1596 (1998) below, the statutory category of the claimed subject matter is not relevant to a determination of whether the claimed subject matter produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result:

The question of whether a claim encompasses statutory subject matter should not focus on which of the four categories of subject matter a claim is directed to -- process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter--but rather on the essential characteristics of the subject matter, in particular, its practical utility. Section 101 specifies that statutory subject matter must also satisfy the other "conditions and requirements" of Title 35, including novelty, nonobviousness, and adequacy of disclosure and notice. See *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1359, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1757-58 (Fed. Cir. 1994). For purpose of our analysis, as noted above, claim 1 is directed to a machine programmed with the Hub and Spoke software and admittedly produces a "useful, concrete, and tangible result." *Alappat*, 33 F.3d at 1544, 31 USPQ2d at 1557. This renders it statutory subject matter, even if the useful result is expressed in numbers, such as price, profit, percentage, cost, or loss.

In determining if the claimed subject matter produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, the Examiner must determine each standard individually. For a claim to be "useful," the claim must produce a result that is specific, and substantial. For a claim to be "concrete," the process must have a result that is reproducible. For a claim to be "tangible," the process must produce a real world result. Furthermore, the claim must be limited only to statutory embodiments.

Claims 2-11 do not require production of a tangible result in a form that is useful to the user of the process or apparatus. The claims are directed to a process to predict the topology of the arrangement of an amino acid sequence in which a calculation is

performed to predict global folding kinetics and stored in a file or other form of digital memory. The output of the process as claimed results in an output that is not accessible to the practitioner of the process. A tangible result requires that the claim must set forth a practical application to produce a real-world result. This rejection could be overcome by amendment of the claims to recite that a result of the process is outputted to a display, or to a user, or in a graphical format, or in a user readable format, or by including a result that is a physical transformation. The applicants are cautioned against introduction of new matter in an amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks p. 13, filed 15 February 2008, with respect to rejection of claims 1 and 3-5 as anticipated Alm et al. under 35 USC 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1 and 3-5 has been withdrawn in view of the cancellation of claim 1.

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks p. 14, filed 15 February 2008, with respect to rejection of claim 1 as anticipated Floudas et al. under 35 USC 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claim 1 has been withdrawn in view of the cancellation of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks p. 14-21, filed 15 February 2008, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-7 and 13 as unpatentable over Floudas et al. in view of Alm et al. under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-7 and 13 has been withdrawn in view of the arguments.

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks p. 22-27, filed 15 February 2008, with respect to the rejection of claims 8 and 11 as unpatentable over Floudas et al. in view of Alm et al. and in view of Dawson et al. under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-7 and 13 has been withdrawn in view of the arguments.

Declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.132

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 15 February 2008 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-7 and 13 based upon Floudas et al. in view of Alm et al. as set forth in the last Office action because: It refer(s) only to the system described in the above referenced application and not to the individual claims of the application. Thus, there is no showing that the objective evidence of nonobviousness is commensurate in scope with the claims. See MPEP § 716. The declaration has three appendices that are directed to the invention. In appendix A, declarant provides opinion regarding what Dawson et al. could calculate. Declarant states the invention of US Patent application 10/695,247 (the instant application) was used to solve the RNA

pseudo knot problem. Declarant further offers opinion of the applied references Floudas et al. and Alm et al. Appendix B provides more opinion regarding Gaussian polymer chain statistics and not considered objective evidence because it contains no authorship or publishing information of any kind. Thus, it is assumed declarant's opinion. Appendix C is a document that is directed to nucleic acid interactions. The document extends assumptions for nucleic acid folding to protein folding in an attempt to explain the invention. Thus, the appendices are directed to opinion and fail to describe how the claims are distinguished over the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, when all of the evidence is considered, the totality of the rebuttal evidence of nonobviousness fails to outweigh the evidence of obviousness.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KARLHEINZ R. SKOWRONEK whose telephone number is (571)272-9047. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marjorie A. Moran can be reached on (571) 272-0720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1631

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

28 June 2008

/K. R. S./

Examiner, Art Unit 1631

/John S. Brusca/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1631